

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and response filed 12/7/09 is acknowledged and has been entered.

It is noted that Applicant has elected without traverse the Invention of Group II, drawn to a method of enhancing immune responses to viral immunogens by administering polypeptides, in the said amendment and response. Accordingly, claims 29-38, 44, 46-53, 56-62 and 64 (non-elected Groups) are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

2. The following requirement for election of species is set forth below as pertains to claims 1, 5, 7-9, 15-17, 19-38 and 40-43.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

a. One immunogen OR more than one immunogen, AND a specific ultimate species of immunogen or immunogens, for example, one immunogen that is gp160 AND a specific species of antigen or antigens, for example, one antigen that is gp160, AND

b. MIP-1 $\alpha$  OR MIP-3 $\alpha$ , AND

c. a specific ultimate species of condition to be treated or prevented, for example HIV infection in a non-neonate, AND

d. An ultimate species of additional adjuvant IF one is administered, for example, GM-CSF.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The immunogens have different sequences. The antigens have different sequences. MIP-1 $\alpha$  and MIP-3 $\alpha$  have different sequences, as is also true for the different adjuvants. The conditions to be treated or prevented are different viral diseases or conditions. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely

Art Unit: 1644

be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined** even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1644

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(h).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 571-272-0842. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Group 1640  
Technology Center 1600

/Ram R. Shukla/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1644